

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 54-64 and 66-98 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 99-104 have been added.

The Examiner has made various rejections of applicants' claims 54-64 and 66-98 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable based on the Shaffer, et al. (US 6,092,114) patent taken with the Kudrolli, et al. (US 6,279,018) patent alone, or with one or more of the Toyoda, et al. (US 5,881,233), Mertama, et al. (US 6,629,130) and Kaufeld, et al. (US 5,859,967) patents. Applicants have canceled claims 54-64 and 66-98, thereby rendering the Examiner's rejections moot. Moreover, to the extent the Examiner believes the rejections are applicable to newly added claims 99-104 they are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' added independent claim 99 recites an information providing apparatus comprising: a reception unit configured to receive transmission information; a memory unit configured to memorize model information and a displayable character count for each of target terminals; an acquiring unit configured to acquire model information of a target terminal indicated by the transmission information received by said reception unit; a reading unit configured to read, from said memory unit, a displayable character count corresponding to the model information acquired by said acquiring unit; a determination unit configured to determine whether the character number of the transmission information exceeds the displayable character count read by said reading unit; a generation unit configured to, in a case where it is determined by said determination unit that the character number of the transmission information exceeds the displayable character count, generate abstract information from the transmission information in accordance with the displayable character count; and a transmission control unit configured to control to transmit the generated abstract

information to the target terminal. Applicants' independent method claim 103 and computer readable medium claim 104 recite similar features. Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record.

More particularly, the Shaffer, et al patent merely teaches a server which checks a format of a file attached to a message to determine whether a client can display the message. If the client cannot display the message, the server converts the file format and sends the converted message to the client. That is, the Shaffer, et al. patent merely teaches file format conversion and fails to teach or suggest anything regarding a displayable character count of a client, let alone generating and forwarding and abstract to the client if a message exceeds such displayable character count.

The Kudrolli, et al. patent, on the other hand, merely teaches abbreviating and compacting text to cope with display space constraints in computer software. This patent, however, also fails to teach or suggest determining whether the character number of transmission information for a target terminal exceeds a displayable character count of the target terminal and, is so, generating abstract information from the transmission information in accordance with the displayable character count and transmitting the generated abstract information to the target terminal.

The Examiner has argued that it would be straightforward to combine the Shaffer, et al. and Kudrolli, et al. patent s to thereby arrive at applicants' claimed invention. In the first place, since the Shaffer, et al. patent concerns file format conversion, and the Kudrolli, et al. patent, compacting text to cope with display space constraints, it is not believed that it would be straightforward to combine the teachings of these references to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. In any case, even if the references could be combined the combination

fails to teach or suggest determining whether the character number of transmission information for a target terminal exceeds a displayable character count of the target terminal and, if so, generating abstract information from the transmission information in accordance with the displayable character count and transmitting the generated abstract information to the target terminal. Applicants' claims 99, 103 and 104, and their respective dependent claims, all of which recite such features, thus patentably distinguish over the Shaffer, et al. and Kudrolli, et al. patents.

The Toyoda, et al. patent teaches transmitting facsimile data after CCIT FAX encoding. The Mertama, et al. patent teaches an apparatus which checks a format of a file included in a message downloaded from a server, determines whether the format of the file can be converted, outputs the file after converting the format of the file if the format can be converted and stops outputting the file if the format of the file cannot be converted. Finally the Kaufeld, et al. patent teaches an accounting system of a format conversion service.


Thus, the Toyoda, et al., Mertama, et al. and Kaufeld, et al. patents fail to add anything to the Schaffer, et al. and Kudrolli, et al. patents to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. Such invention thus patentably distinguishes over all these references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: December 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 790-9273

  
John J. Torrente  
Reg. No. 26359  
Attorney for Applicant